

Vision Group D-System Review and Data
Meeting Minutes for March 17, 2000 10-3p
The Host Airport Hotel, Sacramento

I. Introduction:

- A. Members Present: Ed Armitage, Larry Karsteadt, Deidre Myles, Nancy Justin, Ardith Hamilton, Kurt Latipow, Michael Kassis, Bob Eisenman, Craig Stroup, Steve Andriese, Jim Schneider, Charla Jensen, Karl Sporer M.D., Bob O'Brien, Gary Hinshaw, Tella Williams.
- B. Non-Members Present: Michael Frenn, Bobbi Bonnet, Marty Reed, Stewart McGehee, Mercia Brandon, Miranda Swanson, Sheila Keller, Fred Hawkins.

II. Approval of Minutes:

- A. Corrections: Four corrections were made to the meeting minutes from the January 21, 2000 meeting in Sacramento.
 - 1) Legislation from the group would be in bullet points.
 - 2) There is no support for EMSA to be in charge of legislation.
 - 3) Nancy Justin – Not Present
 - 4) Bob Eisenman – Present

III. Business Items:

Old Business

- I. Alternatives to Conference Calls (Ed Armitage)
 - A. Summary: There are some alternatives to conference calls, but there isn't a list at this time.
 - B. Action Item: Ed is going to see if there is any way the conference calls can be partially done via computer.

II. Work Group D Vision Project Funding

Update on OTS Data Grant

- A. Summary: \$184,000 was received to finance the first 6 months of the project.
 - Bonnie Sinz was placed under contract.
 - Ed is currently looking over a proposal from Logicon, and will speak with them to see if they can be brought on board for the project.
 - Currently advertising for a limited term state position, Information Systems Analyst, as well as Student Assistants, from California State University, Sacramento.

Prevention 2000 Grant Letter Update

- A. Summary: Letter denied.

Search for Other Funding Services

- A. Summary: Currently looking at 14 other grant sources.
- Information was sent to the California Endowment.
 - The System Evaluation Grant runs out July 1, 2000. Currently looking for something to pick up as of July 1st.

III. Review of any Proposed Revisions to the Final Action Plan by Constituency Groups

- A. The following revision were brought to the Leadership Team at their meeting on Thursday, March 9, 2000:

- | | |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1) Objective 1.1 | |
| 2) Goal 7 | Approved to go to action plans |
| 3) Goal 9 | |
| | |
| 1) Objective 5 | |
| 2) Objective 13 | Reassigned to other vision groups |
| 3) Objective 14 | |

IV. Update on Constituency Group Presentations and Endorsement Letters

- A. Summary: A letter was received from the California Ambulance Association, endorsing the action plan. The group picked option #2, supporting the general direction of the action plan as it is written.
- California State Association of Counties* – Consideration of the action plan will be later in the year.
 - Office of Statewide Health Planning Development* – Was presented by Tella Williams. Mike Kassis will be writing a letter to Steve Andriese.
 - California Fire Chiefs* – A presentation was made by Bob O'Brien, and it went over well.
 - California State Firefighters Association* – The action plan has not been presented yet.
 - EMSAAC* – The action plan will be agendaized on Tuesday.
 - Council Hospital Association of Health Plans* – The group is currently working on it. Nothing negative has been expressed as of yet.
 - Emergency Nurses Association* – The action plan was sent to the board, but nothing has been heard yet. Nancy Justin will call to see if there was any progress.

V. Progress Update on Objectives Due for Completion by July 2000

Workgroup D

- A. Summary: Objectives 1.1, to develop guidelines and criteria for periodic evaluation of the performance of the Emergency Medical Services Authority, and 1.2, of local EMS agencies, were not assigned to a workgroup.
- The Baldrige categories as applied to Emergency Medical Services

by NHTSA would be used.

- Miranda was asked to research other states to see where they have gotten with the use of these categories.
- Whatever is decided, it should be used for both the EMS Authority, and Local EMS Agencies.

Subgroup 1

A. Summary:

Objective 3.6 - Completed

- The group is currently looking at data sets.
- Sample sets looked at were NENA, ABCO, EMSA, OSHPED, STATE 911, etc.
- No satisfactory data sets have been found covering the following two categories:

- 1) Computer aided dispatch systems
 - there are no voluntary standards on the systems
- 2) Financial indicators

Objective 2.1.1 – Completed

Objective 2.1.2 – Completed

- Both of the above objectives need to be published and distributed.

Objective 2.1.3 – The data is coming together

Objective 2.1.4 – Held over (Bonnie has the information)

Ad Hoc Group

A. Summary: Bonnie contacted LEMSAs for information.

- Group is seeing about making linkages and what kind of quality can be expected from those linkages.
- It is not known of what kind of percentages can be obtained through the linkages.
- The group is testing the data the currently have, and will need to have some kind of educational process.
- The Miracle Project went through budget committees smoothly.
- Funding was not an issue.

Legislative Presentation 8.1.1 – Completed

- Information on the current statutes and regulations was gathered by Bonnie.
- The California Health and Safety Code requires that statewide guidelines are developed for EMSA.
- 17.97 174 of the Health and Safety Code states:
 - 1) There is no Federal right to privacy in the Federal Constitution
 - 2) There is one for the State in the State Constitution

- Creates a competing situation between the two.
- Information can be gathered from local agencies, but you cannot get patient identifying information from these agencies.
- Objective 8.1.2 – Currently being worked on*
- Objective 8.1.3 – The deadline for this objective should be able to be met*
- There will be an update at the next meeting or the information will be put on the listserve.

Subgroup 2

- A. Summary: The group has a current inventory of 105 indicators.
 - 2 things came of this list of indicators:
 - 1) 61 of the 105 were defined.
 - 2) Of the 61 defined, 25 are being tested.
 - A lot of those being tested were presented at the last meeting.
 - There has been a lot of difficulty in getting results.
 - A list was compiled of most important issues and the major concerns as to what indicators are the most important to develop and should be looked at.
 - It was decided that CAD vendors and the telephone people should be brought in on the issue.
 - Handouts were reviewed and explained (Ways of organization, logical flow of information, etc.)
 - There is an issue of definition. Quality Improvement vs. Quality Assurance.

New Business

I. The Action Plan

- A. Summary: To successfully complete the goals of the action plan, there are 9 documents that are anticipated to be developed.
 - In order to complete these documents, it was suggested that the group do reverse engineering.
 - Core indicators as well as Recommended indicators need to be identified as soon as possible.
 - To do this, Structure indicators, Process indicators, and Outcomes need to be looked at.
 - The group should come up with key questions and subsequently a list of indicators (to help answer the questions).

Key Questions:

- 1) Cardiac survival rate by county M and M.
- 2) Major trauma patient mortality.
- 3) Major trauma patient morbidity.
- 4) CVA M and M.
- 5) Work load conditions.

- 6) Clinical impression vs. DX (diagnosis).
- 7) Onset to intervention.
- 8) AIS/BLS/dry run.
- 9) Procedure frequency.
- 10) Clinical condition – low frequency.
- 11) EMS incidents from all sources are emergent.
- 12) Patient demographics.

IV. Meeting Evaluation

- A. Summary: Overall consensus was that the meeting went well.

V. Future Meeting Dates

- A. Next meeting to take place on May 19, 2000, 10-3pm, at the Sacramento Airport Host Hotel.